

REMARKS

In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,982,748) in view of Ho et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,687,254). The Examiner objected to claims 2-5 as dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner allowed claims 6-10.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's identification of allowable subject matter, but respectfully traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 1-10 remain pending.

In paragraph 2 of the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Yin et al. in view of Ho et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a call admission control method in an ATM switch. The method comprises receiving a QoS (Quality of Service) specified connection request; calculating an assigned bandwidth on a link associated with the QoS-specified connection request; calculating an average bandwidth to be assigned to existing QoS-unspecified traffic on the link associated with the QoS-specified connection request; and determining whether the QoS-specified connection request is accepted based on a combination of the assigned bandwidth and the average bandwidth.

Neither Yin et al. nor Ho et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, discloses or suggests the combination of features recited in claim 1. For example, neither Yin et al. nor Ho et al. discloses or suggests calculating an average bandwidth to be assigned to existing QoS-unspecified traffic on a link associated with a received QoS-specified connection request.

The Examiner admitted that Yin et al. does not disclose or suggest this feature (final Office Action, page 2). The Examiner alleged, however, that Ho et al. discloses the feature and cited column 11, lines 24-27, of Ho et al. for support (final Office Action, page 2). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

At column 11, lines 24-27, Ho et al. discloses:

Thus, for instance, an ABR or UBR connection having an MCR twice as large as another connection will on average receive approximately twice as much buffer space.

In this section, Ho et al. discloses that an available bit rate (ABR) or unspecified bit rate (UBR) connection that has an MCR value (which Ho et al. discloses as a weight defined by a minimum cell rate (col. 3, lines 47-51)) that is twice as large as another connection will on average receive approximately twice as much buffer space as the other connection. In other words, Ho et al. discloses that if an ABR/UBR connection has a minimum cell rate that is twice that of another connection, it will be allocated twice the buffer space as the other connection. Applicant respectfully submits that it is unreasonable to equate this disclosure of Ho et al. with calculating an average bandwidth to be assigned to existing QoS-unspecified traffic on a link associated with a received QoS-specified connection request, as recited in claim 1. In fact, this section of Ho et al. does not even relate to calculating an average bandwidth, let alone, calculating an average bandwidth to be assigned to existing QoS-unspecified traffic on a link, as required by claim 1.

Because neither Yin et al. nor Ho et al. discloses or suggests calculating an average bandwidth to be assigned to existing QoS-unspecified traffic on a link associated with a QoS-specified connection request, Yin et al. and Ho et al. cannot disclose determining whether the

QoS-specified connection request is accepted based on a combination of the assigned bandwidth and the average bandwidth, as further required by claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Yin et al. and Ho et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.


If the Examiner does not believe that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution of this application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: 
Paul A. Harrity
Reg. No. 39,574

Date: August 25, 2005

11240 Waples Mill Road
Suite 300
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
Telephone: 571-432-0800
Facsimile: 571-432-0808